

ACTION ON THE FISHERIES.

A PARLIAMENTARY STATEMENT AND A DISPATCH TO WASHINGTON.

LORD SALISBURY INTERESTED BUT PACIFIC—SIR GEORGE O. TREVELYAN SPEAKS FOR LIBERAL REUNION—THE SOCIALISTS—LITERARY AND ARTISTIC NOTES.

(BY CABLE TO THE TRIBUNE.)
Copyright, 1887, North American Cable News Co.
LONDON, March 1.—Sir James Fergusson said last night in the House of Commons that the Government were giving close attention to the subject of American relations with Canada. They are, I believe, giving it their benevolent attention. Lord Salisbury himself has discovered that the dispute contains elements of interest not inferior to those in Egypt and Bulgaria. The whole question has been gone into anew since the Canadian dispatch proposing a modus vivendi was received. That dispatch is regarded by the Foreign Office as essentially conciliatory in tone and purpose. This Government believes that it contains material for a temporary arrangement, and considers that it really is what it purports to be, an attempt toward a scheme amicably for the time being. Lord Salisbury, taking this as a basis but with modifications, is preparing a long dispatch to the British Minister at Washington which will probably go this week. That dispatch will be very different in tone from some of the productions of the Canadian officials which have seen light in the Blue Book just published. I doubt, from what I know of the views here for the moment prevailing, whether the proposals of the British Government will be deemed acceptable at Washington. But if the real feelings of this Ministry are allowed to appear in this document, Secretary Bayard will discover that they are sincerely anxious to effect a settlement, and still more anxious to reach some agreement which shall prevent trouble during the coming season. My impression is that the English officials who have mastered this fishery literature are disposed to think that the Canadians have good technical pretexts for their policy, which, however, as a policy is considered indiscreet, vexatious and indefensible.

Sir George Otto Trevelyan's letter to the Aberdeen Liberal Unionists is the strongest declaration yet made public in favor of the immediate reunion of the Liberal party. He believes that the moment is ripe for such a reunion, on terms honorable to all concerned, and is satisfied that if Liberals of both wings can work together the Liberal party alone can deal with the Irish question at this juncture.

The House of Commons devoted itself all yesterday to the Supply, and succeeded in passing votes amounting to \$200,000.

The Social disturbances on Sunday at St. Paul's Cathedral and elsewhere would certainly have been serious had not Sir Charles Warren, Commissioner of Police, taken elaborate precautions. The West End, whether it was supposed the mob might attempt a journey, was strongly garrisoned and streets like Pall Mall were lined with police from end to end. The newspaper accounts of what actually took place, says the Home Secretary, were much exaggerated. Still the brawling in St. Paul's was a nuisance which these gentry will not be allowed to repeat.

This Government possesses a First Commissioner of Works who is made of sterner stuff than its ring-ringer in Westminster-General. The Hon. David L. Hunt has faced and felled the clique of Subalterns, some of them professionals, who tried to induce him to reverse his decision allowing Sunday beating in the London parks. Vainly was that favorite bugbear of the "Continental Sabbath" banished in his face. Mr. Hunt replied in his bland, firm way that he would consider the memorial, but saw no reason for recalling the privilege which he had granted. The new rule has been in operation for some time, and has caused no harm, but much innocent pleasure, and this especially to the poorer classes.

A column of banter on Mr. Gladstone's "Nineteenth Century" study of Pseidon appears in "The Daily News." This article, signed "Andrew Lang," in every line, is mostly civil in phrase, but in substance is a denial of Mr. Gladstone's competence as a scholar to handle the subject he discusses. He goes to Homer for evidence concerning Pseidon's true character; but Mr. Lang thinks Homer is not authority on this subject, which must be referred to traditions antecedent to Homer. Mythologies, he observes irreverently, will read Mr. Gladstone with curiosity but not accept his conclusions or acquiesce in his method.

The extraordinary decree of appointment bestowed upon Mr. John Morley's address on "The Study of Literature" is perhaps his best justification for going into politics. Had he not been a Cabinet Minister this admirable discourse would never have been printed verbatim in "The Times," nor been made the subject of an elaborate editorial in every important journal. It is impossible to summarize the address, which is the work of a writer whose literary range is wider than that of any but one or two living Englishmen. Mr. Morley is deemed by his practical countrymen to be himself the best proof of the soundness of the ideas he urges as to the value of a wise use of literature.

The burning question of the personal relations between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain is now discussed more warmly than ever. An accident prevented their meeting at dinner on Saturday night, and again their meeting on Wednesday week, when both had agreed to dine with Sir Arthur and Lady Hayter. The speaker has now commanded Mr. Chamberlain to dine with him on that evening. Neither was at Lady Hayter's reception on Saturday evening, which nevertheless proved to be crowded, delightful and late; illuminated, moreover, by some American beauty.

The most interesting of recent etchings is Mr. Macbeth's rendering of the late Mr. George Mason's "The May of Life," published by Mr. Dunthorne. This picture is well known and has long been reckoned one of Mr. Macbeth's best in its pleasing, pastoral way. Mr. Macbeth, who has a style of his own, has reproduced Mr. Mason's work with a spirit as sympathetic as his technical skill is remarkable.

An amusing exhibition is shortly to be opened in Bond-st. by Mr. Harry Furness, the artist who enriches the columns of "Punch" by good-natured caricatures of the work of other artists. This gallery will contain seventy drawings in black and white, all burlesques upon well-known pictures by Sir Frederick Leighton, Professor Holman, Mr. Orchardson, Mr. Piles and others. Mr. Morley will appear as the painter of Lady Godiva, presumably with all her clothes on.

Professor Berkeley has been elected an Honorary Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, a very considerable compliment which he shares with Mr. Gladstone.

REVOLT AGAINST THE BULGARIAN REGENCY.

LONDON, March 1.—Dispatches received here from Sofia say that the troops of the Bulgarian Regency yesterday evening and pronounced against the Regency. Troops are marching to Sofia from Ruse, Varna and Shumen to quell the mutiny.

RUMOR ABOUT BISMARCK AND BOULANGER.

LONDON, March 1.—A dispatch from Paris this afternoon to the Exchange Telegraph Company says it is believed that Prince Bismarck intends to request

President Grevy to dismiss General Boulanger from the post.

Later, the Exchange Telegraph Company issued a statement that there was no foundation for the report.

PARNELL DEFEATED AT EVERY POINT.

HELP FROM THE LIBERALS DOES NOT SAVE HIS AMENDMENTS.

LONDON, March 1.—In the debate on the procedure rules this evening Mr. Molloy, on behalf of Mr. Parnell, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

Mr. Parnell on the ground that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature, moved an amendment that closure should not be applied until the subject under discussion had been debated. Mr. Smith opposed the motion, saying that the Government intended to propose an amendment of a similar nature.

American Socialists to assist in the election of Socialist candidates to the Reichstag.

SIX SAVED OUT OF SIX HUNDRED.

A CROWDED CHINESE JUNK WRECKED—DISASTER IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA.

SAN FRANCISCO, March 1.—The steamer Gallo, from China and Japan, which left yesterday, reports that a Chinese junk bound from Hainan for Siam, has been wrecked, and that out of the 600 persons comprising her passengers and crew, only six are known to have escaped.

EXPLOSION IN THE BEAUBRUN MINES.

SIXTEEN COLLIERIES KILLED—104 MEN ENTOMBED—43 RESCUED.

PARIS, March 1.—An explosion occurred to-day in the Beaubrun collieries at Valenciennes, which entombed 104 men. Forty-three have been rescued, and sixteen are dead.

VON BULOW NOT PERMITTED TO HEAR "MERLIN."

BERLIN, March 1.—The opera "Merlin" was produced to-night. It is a great success. A sensation was caused by the refusal of the management to admit the pianist Von Bulow to the theatre, although he was provided with a ticket. This action is attributed to the new intention, in revenge for Von Bulow's spiteful criticism of the management of the theatre.

THE POOL BEER BOYCOTT BEGUN.

FREE DEALERS WILL NOT ACT HASTILY.

CHANGES TO BE MADE AS CIRCUMSTANCES MAKE THEM ADVISABLE—BREWERS NOT AFRAID.

The Wine, Beer and Liquor Dealers' Association appears to be in earnest in its determination to boycott the brewers who have formed a pool to maintain prices until the pool is broken. It was the intention to stop until the pool is broken. It was the intention to stop until the pool is broken. It was the intention to stop until the pool is broken.

The members of the Executive Committee of the retailers were busy yesterday in visiting the different association dealers and distributing the "no-pool" cards. They called on Secretary Seiler, of the Croxley High License Bill. The subject of the pool was not brought up.

The trouble arises from Section 6 in the pool agreement, which provides that the price of beer shall be \$5 a barrel less 5 per cent for all customers who have arrangements with a brewer after November 1, the date of the formation of the pool. Customers who do not have such arrangements are to be charged the full price.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

There are in New-York and its vicinity only six brewers who are outside of the pool. They are James E. Keegan, George Reiche, the Corporation Brewing Co., and Joseph Fallert. They have a capacity of about 300,000 barrels a year. The pool brewers make about 1,000,000 barrels a year.

O'NEIL IN HIS PRISON CELL.

TAKEN THE RIVER WITH ROUGE.

TWO OTHER CONVICTS GO WITH THEM TO SING SING.

THE EX-ALDERMAN IN A LITTLE MOOD.

HONEST JOHN O'NEIL, ex-Alderman, school trustee and Sinking Fund Commissioner, joined the "Boatload" squad at Sing Sing yesterday. The old man had held out obstinately through his years against a transfer from the Tombs, but Judge Barnard refused to grant a further stay of proceedings against him to the inevitable indignities of a trip to the Hudson with the Sheriff's officers—the handcuffs, the public shame, the fire of hundreds of curious eyes—with a listless and broken spirit of resignation that could have come only of despair.

He was self-controlled enough all the way through and said good-bye to his two sons at the Sing Sing station without much show of feeling. A rough contact